

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BROWN COUNTY
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Pursuant to Section 19.84 Wis. Stats., a budget meeting of the Brown County Executive Committee was held on Monday, October 23, 2017 in Room 200 of the Northern Building, 305 E. Walnut Street, Green Bay, Wisconsin.

Present: Chair Lund, Supervisor Hoyer, Supervisor Erickson, Supervisor Moynihan, Supervisor Gruszynski (for Supervisor Van Dyck), Supervisor Schadewald, Supervisor Buckley

Also Present: Finance Manager Dave Ehlinger, Senior Accountant Sandy Parmer, Human Resources Analyst Camille Stymiest, Human Resources Director Kathryn Roellich, Internal Auditor Dan Process, Director of Administration Chad Weininger, County Executive Troy Streckenbach, Park and Zoo Director Neil Anderson, Public Works Director Paul Fontecchio, Public Health Officer Anna Destree, District Attorney Dave Lasee, DA Office Manager Michele Andresen, Planning Director Chuck Lamine, Health and Human Services Director Erik Pritzl, Corporation Counsel Dave Hemery, Supervisors Sieber, Brusky and Kneiszel, other interested parties and news media

I. Call meeting to order.

The meeting was called to order by Chair Lund at 5:30 pm.

II. Approve/modify agenda.

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Schadewald to take Item 28 following Item 2 and to strike Item 12 from the Agenda. Vote taken. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

III. Approve/modify Minutes of October 9, 2017.

Motion made by Supervisor Hoyer, seconded by Supervisor Schadewald to approve. Vote taken. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Comments from the Public – Budgetary Items. None.

Communications. None.

1. Review Minutes of:

a) Benefits Advisory Committee (September 20, 2017).

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Gruszynski to receive and place on file. Vote taken. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Non-divisional Budgets

2. County Executive – Review of 2018 Department Budget.

The County Executive budget is set forth on Pages 272 – 274 of the budget book.

County Executive Troy Streckenbach informed the Committee there is not a lot to this budget. The funding for NEWEYE in the amount of \$10,000 has been removed from the budget. He split that amount up and gave \$5,000 to the Museum to be used primarily for the County's 200th anniversary celebration and the remaining \$5,000 will be retained in the County Executive budget. The other large expense is the contribution to Advance in the amount of \$75,000.

Streckenbach continued that last year there was a motion that anyone at a certain pay rate would have to be given a pay increase to remain exempt or would have to be paid overtime but that law has not technically taken full effect. Last year the Executive Assistant in the Executive's Office was made hourly and this year they are moving the employee back to the exempt status.

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Schadewald to approve the County Executive budget as presented. Vote taken. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Although shown in the proper format here, Item 28 was taken at this time.

3. Board of Supervisors - Review of 2018 Department Budget.

The Board of Supervisors budget is set forth on Pages 268 – 270 of the budget book.

Board Chair Pat Moynihan informed the budget is self-explanatory, other than the motion that was passed at Item 28 below. The only thing he added was that there was nothing included for Supervisor raises.

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Buckley to approve the Board of Supervisor's budget as amended. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

4. Capital Projects.

The Capital Projects budget is set forth on Pages 276 – 315 of the budget book.

Director of Administration Chad Weininger informed the 2018 budget highlights the capital projects on Page 276. Page 279 provides a more detailed breakdown. The columns show the beginning balance, the sales tax transfer in, property taxes and other revenues for all of the projects highlighted in the back of the book. The 2018 proposed sales tax projects are broken down on Page 280.

Supervisor Schadewald asked who the reporting committee for collection and expenditures of the sales tax will be. Weininger said he will include sales tax collections in his monthly report to the Administration Committee. There has been some discussion on going out for RFP to hire project managers that would oversee the projects. For instance, with regard to the jail project, an RFP would be done for a project manager and the jail would then have oversight by the Public Safety Committee and the project manager would report to that committee and also keep administration and facilities in the loop. That same process would be followed with any of the large building projects. Some of the other projects that are not quite as large will be managed by current staff.

Supervisor Hoyer said he has been tasked with representing the Mental Health Ad Hoc Committee and one of the key issues that has been pushed back is development and planning of a one stop shop for crisis. This is something that has the full force of the ad hoc committee membership behind it, including representatives of the Board of Supervisors, District Attorney, County and City law enforcement and the Human Services Department. Hoyer said they are looking to see if they can find dollars this year to start the process. He noted there are a lot of projects in the capital projects and asked if there is anything that can be done to ramp up the one stop shop model. Weininger said originally a six year CIP was brought forward and the one stop shop model was scheduled somewhere in 2019 or 2020 to give everyone enough time to talk through what was wanted. The larger issue is the cash flowing of the projects since the County will not be bonding for any of these projects. Weininger will not know if things can be moved around until the sales tax collections are known and he noted they were very conservative in the budgeting of the sales tax. If the numbers come in higher than expected there may be some flexibility to let some of the projects start earlier but this will not be known until the sales tax starts coming in. The County Executive wanted as much moved up to the front end as possible.

Moynihan noted there is no mention of an expo center. Weininger said Corporation Counsel is currently working on an MOU and as soon as that is complete they will figure out how to proceed with the project which will likely include an architect that will act as the project manager. He noted no debt will be issued for this because there is the \$4 million dollars. There are several years until the RDA and CDA bonds are paid off so this is more of a financial calculation that does not need to be included.

With regard to Projects 15 (Duck Creek Shoreline Stabilization) and 16 (Barkhausen Improvements) on Page 280, Supervisor Buckley does not recall talking about these projects as being part of the sales tax projects. Weininger said these projects were identified in the CIP that was recently approved. The ordinance outlined some broad brush strokes of park projects and these two projects are subprojects of the overall park projects. Buckley's concern is that Project 3 (jail pods) has only \$1 million dollars allocated for architectural services. He feels more effort should be put towards this project in light of the expenditures being made in sending inmates out to other counties. Weininger responded that the cash flow is not in front of the Committee but it will actually start in February. The goal would be to start working with Facilities on an RFP for an architect to act as project manager to work with the oversight committee, Facilities and the Sheriff's Department.

Buckley gets concerned when the broad brush strokes include things in larger allocations. He would like to address the larger projects and get those up and running and find out how much they are going to cost before starting some of the smaller projects. Weininger responded that this will be cash flowed out and he has to wait to see how much is coming in to make further projections and noted they were very conservative in the numbers so unless there is a huge downturn in the economy it should be more than fine.

Streckenbach asked Buckley if his concern was more with the price estimate of the architectural work. Buckley said his concern is just doing architectural work next year and not getting any site work done. Weininger said the architectural work needs to be done prior to any site work. Buckley said it was his understanding that most of the architectural work was already done, however Weininger said it needs to be redrawn because there are new standards. He said we need to bring in a project manager that can walk through those things and as long as we can cash flow, we can do it. The next steps will depend on what can be cash flowed and what cannot. Some of the smaller projects like Buckley referenced earlier can be moved back or forward depending on the cash flow. The other option would be to take out a loan to do a lot more work on the front end, but Weininger does not recommend that. Buckley said he does not want to bring in a lot of smaller projects and slow down the major projects that the sales tax was actually passed for. Weininger responded that the ordinance spelled out all the projects and the cash flow was built around the jail project. Buckley reiterated his concern about the brush strokes being too broad and Weininger reiterated that he will not really know the cash flow until March but at that time the Board can make decisions about moving things around.

Streckenbach said it was his understanding that everyone signed off on the timeline with the goal of having the new jail pods constructed and operating by 2019. Buckley understood that, but referenced how long the garage project at the Sheriff's Department took and he wants to be sure the project continues to move forward and is not slowed down because we are funding other projects. Weininger understood and said there will regular updates to the Public Safety Committee through the project manager.

Supervisor Schadewald said the idea of getting progress reports is to understand the cash flow and the progress on projects. Over the next six years, the County Board will need to be updated. He also wants the Board to realize the plan is flexible and fluid because the amount coming in from the tax could be more or less than projected and the Board would then have the ability to prioritize the projects. With regard to the jail project, Schadewald wants to be sure that we are doing things right and building what we need and what will be beneficial to the County, despite the amount of money being spent currently on shipping inmates out.

Chair Lund added that some of the projects have other entities paying for them. For example, the STEM project shows \$4,200,000 being paid for by the County and \$3,300,000 being paid for from other sources and the Duck Creek Shoreline Stabilization project shows \$270,000 being paid by the County and the other \$270,000 coming from a grant so the project needs to be done during the term of the grant.

Streckenbach said the priority and focus should be on tackling the levy cost items. The ME's office, east Library and jail are in the forefront of the conversation because all of those projects cost money if we do not do anything. It is his hope the County Board along with the public and administration can come up with some decisions on these projects.

Supervisor Gruszynski said it is important to remember that all of the Supervisors on the Committee came into the sales tax conversations with a very different list of priorities.

Motion made by Supervisor Schadewald, seconded by Supervisor Hoyer to approve the Capital Projects budget as presented. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

5. Debt Service.

Debt Service is set forth on Pages 317 – 323 of the budget book.

Weininger informed the County will not be taking out any additional debt in 2018 and will be paying off roughly \$14 million dollars. The statutory debt limit is \$1 billion dollars and we are quite a bit under that at \$118 million dollars. The outstanding debt for general obligation is \$112 million dollars and when the other loans are factored in the amount is \$118 million dollars. Page 320 of the budget book shows what the current and proposed debt service requirements are by fund. This does factor in the refinance but it is a little bit off because we received a little bit better deal than we were anticipating.

Motion made by Supervisor Buckley, seconded by Supervisor Moynihan to approve the Debt Service as presented. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

6. Special Taxes and Revenue.

Special Taxes and Revenues are set forth on Pages 325 – 344 of the budget book.

Weininger informed personal property taxes are included in the general property taxes. Shared revenues have not changed much and neither has computer aid. The intra-county charge refers to chargebacks to departments and this is the revenue to offset it so all the departments are made whole; while one department is going up another department may be going down. The reason this is done is to capture the grant revenue and chargebacks to state and federal agencies. Weininger continued that no unassigned fund balance is being used because the projects will be cash flowed and the general fund will be used to smooth that out because there may be a month or two where we are negative.

Weininger continued that the salary increases are reflected in the regular earnings budget only line on Page 325 of the budget book. The increases were not put in each individual department because there are typically changes to that. The contingency is \$300,000 with the hope that the full levy capacity of \$800,000 would not be used and this \$300,000 can be used instead for one-time expenses. The reason this is done is because net construction is only about \$1 million dollars and with health insurance or the Sheriff's department having a large increase for boarding prisoners, if this happens again next year it will eat that up and there will not be anything left over for wage increases or cost to continue so we need to start drilling down on streamlining our government a little better.

Page 326 outlines the different funds and more information on those funds is contained on the following pages. Funds of interest are the health and dental insurance as well as the worker's compensation insurance fund. Schadewald said with regard to the health and dental insurance, the County is self-funded and the fund balance does not look very healthy. He feels there should be at least two months in reserve. Weininger agreed that the fund should be larger and this is the reason premiums had to be increased. This cannot be a cost shifting thing; the total pot needs to be increased.

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Gruszynski to approve the Special Taxes and Revenue as presented. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Schadewald to suspend the rules to take Item 27 next. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Although shown in the proper format here, Item 27 was taken at this time.

Following Item 27, the following motions were made regarding Items 7 – 29.

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Erickson to suspend the rules to take Items 7 – 29 together with the exception of Item 12 which was struck from the agenda and Items 27 & 28. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Schadewald to pull Items 13 and 23 and approve Items 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 24, 25, 26 and 29. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Resolutions, Ordinances

7. Resolution Regarding Updates to Existing Employee Compensation during the 2018 Budget Process.

Revised documents were distributed at the meeting, a copy of which is attached.

See motion to approve preceding Item 7.

8. Resolution Approving Changes to Employee Benefits during the 2018 Budget Process.

A revised document was distributed at the meeting, a copy of which is attached.

See motion to approve preceding Item 7.

9. **Resolution Approving New or Deleted Positions during the 2018 Budget Process in the Technology Services Department Table of Organization - Enterprise Cyber Security Technician.**

See motion to approve preceding Item 7.

10. **Resolution Approving New or Deleted Positions during the 2018 Budget Process in the Administration Department Table of Organization – Organizational Development Coordinator.**

See motion to approve preceding Item 7.

11. **Resolution Approving New or Deleted Positions during the 2018 Budget Process in the Administration Department Table of Organization – Public Information Officer.**

See motion to approve preceding Item 7.

12. **Resolution Approving New or Deleted Positions during the 2018 Budget Process in the Administration Department Table of Organization – Payroll Specialists and HRIS Analyst.**

This item was struck from the agenda under Item 11 above.

13. **Resolution Approving New or Deleted Positions during the 2018 Budget Process in the Administration Department Table of Organization – Administration Department “Department”.**

Supervisor Schadewald asked Weininger to explain this and said it is the way the County should be doing business. Weininger noted Supervisor Sieber asked that this Item be pulled and he will address any concerns Sieber has. Sieber said he mimics the comments he made earlier regarding the County Board staff. From his perspective, good policy is waiting for PayScale before giving across the board raises. The argument he has heard mercilessly is that when departments are able to find savings in their departments they want to give those savings out as raises. He had no problem with this in the past because that was the only way we were able to give raises but now there is a plan in place to have PayScale come in and analyze positions, find out where they are at according to market and then give raises or the CPI, depending on where the positions fall. The market data will be up to date and in real time and live. There will also be access to professional HR consultants to help with any issues we run into and Sieber thinks this is a very good policy. He reiterated he is against across the board raises not based on anything, especially when there is a plan in place. He would love to see the money from the half position that is being deleted go into the 2% pot and then given out according to whoever needs it most. He knows the Director of Administration will fight for his employees as all department heads do, but to be fair, there are some areas of real turnover and some really pressing needs that need to be addressed and he feels we need to be consistent across the board instead of looking at specific departments.

Weininger said one thing he has been consistent with throughout all Committee meetings is treating employees fairly. This is not just a pay increase; it is a department reorg. He did not just find savings; the proposal is actually to eliminate a position. The position elimination came at the suggestion of his staff. His department has gone from 21.5 people down to 15 employees and a lot of that has to do with his staff saying they can restructure and do more work if the position is eliminated and this is a reward for their hard work and efforts in finding ways to streamline County services. To take this away would set a very bad precedent. Weininger agreed with Sieber that PayScale hopefully will solve a lot of the inequities, but by taking these savings away, the 2% pot will be lessened and there will be less to pay for those positions. Weininger continued that this is not just adjusting someone's salary, this is people doing a lot more work and the 2% pot will not be enough to bump everyone up, especially spread countywide. PayScale is great and will help get us closer to market, but it is not going to solve everything.

Weininger continued that fairness is really, really important, but at PD & T a vote was taken to solve inequity in one of the departments that report to that Committee, but then the same person created an inequity in Administration which is a department that he does not oversee. Weininger said there have been inconsistencies all across the board, but one thing that has always been consistent is that if a position is eliminated and someone else takes on the work, you allow the person to get a piece of the eliminated wages and that way people feel invested in helping find solutions and streamlining functions. He noted if this piece is taken away, Administration staff will probably still offer suggestions and work on streamlining and finding cost savings. Weininger said if this was a straight up pay increase because he found a few extra dollars he would not have brought this forward because he has said at other committees that everyone needs to be

treated fairly but this is consistent with treating everyone fairly. He feels it is a disservice to ask departments to make cuts and then tell them they are probably not going to keep the funds to compensate staff, especially when they hit the levy limits

Moynihan said he was gratified by Weininger's comments because it is the exact mindset he has with regard to Item 28 regarding Board staff.

Weininger reiterated he agrees with fairness among staff and respects Sieber as a Supervisor, but said this is a variance of what he is talking about.

Sieber said he and Weininger get along very well and work very well together. From his perspective the precedent this would set is if a department can find savings through technology or otherwise, the department is then going to be able to take those savings, spread out the job duties and give staff raises which are not based on PayScale, but based on being able to find technology or eliminate positions and spread the job duties out and to him that is not based at all on market value. Sieber feels everyone should be based on a plan and program and be paid at market value; but he noted some positions we cannot get at market value, some we have to go higher and for others we may be able to go less than market value. He noted the County has people who are being paid 60% - 85% of market and that is where the money should be going and this should be determined by PayScale, not by a department being able to find savings or spread job duties out.

Weininger said this would create inequity in his department in that they are making people do more, but not compensating them for it. Weininger said even better than PayScale is the fact that the Finance Director is the Vice President of WGFOA and posts all the finance jobs in the state and is in tune to what people are making and can attest to what is currently being paid in Brown County is really low. He brought this forward in the comp and class because HR was not done and Finance was done at the last minute and they used bad data from a different organization that did not mirror Brown County. Weininger said there is high demand and pointed out they still do not have a Risk Manager. Not passing this will create inequity and will send the wrong message. He has a well-functioning department and if this is not approved, it will cause problems in the department.

Schadewald said he supports the pay increases in this Item as well as Item 23 and noted that PayScale is not going to be some kind of wonder drug that is going to solve everything. There will still be arguments and debates about different things. He pointed out that staffing in the Department of Administration is being decreased. Lund said when staff is reduced in a department, even if you pay the remaining staff higher wages, the other costs in benefits go down. If the employees are paid a little more per hour and are happy and feel like they are getting a good deal and are appreciated, they will work harder. Schadewald said the Administration Committee did their due diligence in looking not only at just pay but also staffing levels and that is not always something they talk about. When department heads come and say they can work with less staff by rearranging duties, that is a plus and he would encourage department heads to do this. Typically we only see department heads coming forward when they need more staff. Schadewald urges the Committee to support this motion.

Moynihan questioned where Item 7 comes into play for situations where there are requests for wage adjustments and if the 1.84% being proposed is added to all of the reclasses. Weininger said the general rule which is also spelled out in the updated resolution is that if the position was already in existence and budgeted for in the 2018 budget they will receive the 1.84% increase. Newly created positions for 2018 would not receive the 1.84%. The positions Moynihan mentioned for Board Office staff would receive the 1.84% increase.

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Schadewald to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

- 14. Resolution Approving a Change in Position during the 2018 Budget Process in the Zoo and Parks Department – Parks Table of Organization.**

See motion to approve preceding Item 7.

- 15. Resolution Approving New or Deleted Positions during the 2018 Budget Process in the Zoo and Parks Department – Zoo Table of Organization.**

See motion to approve preceding Item 7.

- 16. Resolution Approving a Change in Position during the 2018 Budget Process in the Executive's Office Table of Organization.**

See motion to approve preceding Item 7.

- 17. Resolution Approving New or Deleted Positions during the 2018 Budget Process in the Health & Human Services Department – Community Programs Table of Organization – Behavioral Health Supervisor – Crisis Coordinator.**

See motion to approve preceding Item 7.

- 18. Resolution Approving New or Deleted Positions during the 2018 Budget Process in the Health & Human Services Department – Community Programs Table of Organization – Social Worker/Case Managers and Social Worker Supervisor.**

See motion to approve preceding Item 7.

- 19. Resolution Approving New or Deleted Positions during the 2018 Budget Process in the Health & Human Services Department – Community Services Table of Organization – Clerk II.**

See motion to approve preceding Item 7.

- 20. Resolution Approving New or Deleted Positions during the 2018 Budget Process in the Health & Human Services Department – Community Services Table of Organization – Clerk II.**

See motion to approve preceding Item 7.

- 21. Resolution Approving New or Deleted Positions during the 2018 Budget Process in the Health & Human Services Department – Public Health Table of Organization.**

See motion to approve preceding Item 7.

- 22. Resolution Approving New or Deleted Positions during the 2018 Budget Process in the Port & Resource Recovery Department Table of Organization.**

See motion to approve preceding Item 7.

- 23. Resolution Regarding Reclassification of a Journeyman Electrician Position in the Public Works – Facilities Table of Organization.**

Schadewald asked Sieber if this should wait for PayScale. Sieber responded that in his mind, we have someone in a journeyman position who is a master electrician. We are not giving him more money than the current master electricians; we are bringing him up to the regular level of master electricians where they are now. We are treating him fairly and equally because we are bringing him up from a journeyman to a master which is what he is and paying him at a master level. We are not giving all the masters raises. We are just bringing up a journeyman to a master pay level because that is what he is. To Sieber this is fine because it is not raising pay across the board in the department. There is a valid argument and valid data on why we are bringing him up to the salary of the other masters.

Schadewald said he supports this, but to him he is hearing we are raising someone's salary and changing the table of organization because the employee did something. He has not heard of us changing the table of organization or giving a raise because an employee does something or furthers their education. Changes are typically based on the evaluation and the needs of the department. Schadewald said he understands Sieber's explanation, but he feels differently about it.

Moynihan said he feels this is a matter of fairness and we have discussed this several times in the past. If the journeyman is doing the same thing as the master electricians but is being paid substantially less, it is not fair.

Hoyer advised that we need to be careful about the difference between the person versus the position. We may want to give a raise to the person, but the fact of the matter is when looking at a table of organization, we are looking at position.

We have to consider if the person chose not to come back to work the next day, would we hire a master electrician or would we hire a journeyman. We get into this because we like these people and get to know them and work with them and we may want to give the person a raise, but when it comes to the person versus the position, we need to be careful.

Moynihan said he is not looking at the individual; he is looking at it as a matter of fairness and the person is doing the job of master electrician. Hoyer agreed and said we need to look at the table of organization and how it has shifted over the years. Lund said the reason he would approve this is because the duties were not delineated as to a journeyman only doing certain things and the masters doing only certain things; they are doing the same duties and the same work and as a matter of fairness the journeyman should be at the same level as the masters because he has the qualifications of that level. If the work would have been parsed out that the journeyman only did journeyman work and did not do masters work, then it would be different. Lund was told they are all doing the same duties and HR did not find anything that delineated why we had the masters level and the journeyman and because of that he will support this. If someone goes ahead in a different department and gets a master's degree or doctorate but they do not really need it, Lund would not agree that they need to be paid at a masters or doctorate level if nobody else is being paid at that level. In the case of the electricians, the masters are being paid at the masters' level and the journeyman is doing master level work.

Motion made by Supervisor Schadewald, seconded by Supervisor Erickson to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Supervisor Erickson was excused at 7:08 pm.

- 24. Resolution Approving New or Deleted Positions during the 2018 Budget Process in the Public Works Department – Facilities Management Table of Organization.**

See motion to approve preceding Item 7.

- 25. Resolution Approving New or Deleted Positions during the 2018 Budget Process in the Public Works Department – Highway Table of Organization.**

See motion to approve preceding Item 7.

- 26. Resolution Approving New or Deleted Positions during the 2018 Budget Process in the UW Extension Table of Organization.**

See motion to approve preceding Item 7.

- 27. Resolution Approving New or Deleted Positions during the 2018 Budget Process in the District Attorney Office Table of Organization.**

Buckley informed he has some concerns with the proposal to add three additional DAs. His concern is that this is not a very well thought out plan and was kind of put together at the last minute. He does not dispute the DA's office needs the help, but additional help is the State's responsibility. The County has already funded two additional positions and the three additional positions being proposed was done in an attempt to get people to trial and through the system faster. After the initial request was made and the dollar amount for the three positions was given, additional amounts were brought up for things like additional jury expenses and additional courthouse security for increasing the number of trials as well as two additional positions in the DA's office for support staff, but there is no real test that this is going to clear out the problem. Buckley continued that in talking with the public defender's office, he found that they do not have the staff to take on additional trials. He does not want to put a lot of money towards something that is not going to get us any further ahead than where we are now until we can fix the problem all the way through and reiterated that this was put together too quickly by the group that brought this forward.

District Attorney Dave Lasee and Office Manager Michele Andresen addressed the Committee. Lasee said the request for additional DAs was not made by him and is not in his budget. However, he is in a unique position where he cannot turn down the positions if they are offered because they do need the additional staffing and it is tied to overall system efficiency. If things continue as they currently are, the jail overcrowding issues will continue with no improvement. This request for additional DAs was directly tied to an attempt to move things quicker through the system. Lasee noted they are not necessarily seeing a lot more new faces in the jail, they are seeing the same faces for longer periods of time. There are currently 126 people sitting in jail for more than six months waiting for trial. Part of that is tied to DA staffing,

but part of it has to do with the public defenders and part of it has to do with the defendants driving the process. Lasee agreed with Buckley in that adding three positions is not a simple fix. It would help the problems by allowing the courts to function a little more efficiently than they do now, but Lasee cannot absolutely guarantee it will clear up the overcrowding at the jail. He noted the Sheriff budgeted for 50 people to be shipped out on a daily basis, but today they were shipping out 69. Clearing out 25 people from the jail at \$40 per day for 365 days per year would more than cover the cost for these additional positions. Lasee said if these positions are granted, they would be tied directly to getting people sitting in jail to trial, not the issue of the backlog in the system. The idea of adding this additional staff came out of the Criminal Justice Coordinating Board (CJCB), but Lasee agreed with Buckley that the proposal came about in a relatively short time period.

Erickson said this proposal involves a large amount of money, especially if it does not accomplish what it is intended to do and noted that the County is already paying two additional DAs. He questioned if all the judges are on board with this and said it is his understanding that some judges have very full calendars while others have open time. Erickson also questioned if there were enough public defenders to handle these cases. With regard to the judges' calendars, Lasee responded that they are all busy, but some are busier than others based on the way the system is currently structured. At this time, six of the branches handle criminal cases and the other two branches handle the other matters such as family and juvenile. The branches handling the criminal work are busier than those that do not handle criminal work. Part of the reason only six branches handle criminal matters is because the DA has asked them not to have all eight branches handle criminal matters because the DA does not have staff to staff eight courtrooms. One of the things they would like to do if these positions are added is spread the criminal cases out a little more evenly and efficiently throughout all eight branches. Lasee said he is confident in conversations with the judges that not all of them are on board with this. With regard to Erickson's question about the public defenders, Lasee explained the public defender's office is staffed in a different way. They have an office located in town and about half of the cases stay in town and the rest are farmed out to the private bar who take appointments at \$40 an hour which is a dramatically lower wage than would normally be charged. The public defender's office is having difficulty finding outside counsel to take the work. Lasee also noted if there are multiple co-defendants on one case, which happens, the public defender's office can only represent one defendant while the others are conflicted out. They have had cases with as many as 50 defendants and they have to find public defenders for all of them. Public defenders are being pulled in from La Crosse, Milwaukee and Dane County and this has also led to some of the system efficiencies. Lasee said the caseload in the DA's office is much higher than those in the public defender's office and he has numbers to support that. He said the public defenders work hard, but they have quotas while the DA's office does not. Lasee does not want to suggest at all that the public defender's office would have an easy time finding more staff.

Erickson said he is not against the DA's office in any way and supports them in many ways. He continued that he recently had a conversation with an individual from the State of Wisconsin and asked their opinion of adding three more staff and what the odds were that Brown County will ever get additional DAs from the State. The person Erickson spoke with indicated that if the County keeps paying for DAs, the State will never pay for them but instead will look at Brown County as the example of how things should be done.

Erickson continued that everyone is innocent until proven guilty, but it seems like a pretty good percentage are found guilty and he questioned if having more trials and getting people out of the jail is just going to result in them coming back into the jail sooner. Lund noted that some of those currently sitting in the jail will be convicted and then sent to the State prison system. Erickson said no matter what is done, we are still going to need to add a pod to the jail. Buckley agreed and said this proposal is not going to alleviate the need for the additional pod. Lasee added this proposal was never tied to construction of a pod. Erickson said this proposal came about very quickly and he would have rather have seen this come up much earlier in the year to allow time to get questions answered. He does not think the problem can be solved by throwing money at it; he feels problems are solved by hard work, initiatives and good ideas.

Lund feels adding another judge would also make a difference, but that would be another big expense and the State would have to buy off on it, but the State also seems to have budgetary problems.

Moynihan said to the DA's own admissions, this is not something that he brought forward. Tonight he is going to vote no, although he noted that he would be able to change his mind at the budget hearing. He likened this to hiring a contractor to build a house and you hope the contractor has a blueprint. Moynihan said this looks like a proposal to spend some money and see what sticks and he does not feel this is good governance. He would like to see an actual plan. He fully supports that the DA's office needs help, but there are a lot of moving pieces that need to be considered. Moynihan reiterated that he supports the DA's office, but unless he can be persuaded by language tonight, he is going to vote no at this time.

Schadewald said the idea of us taking on the State's responsibility is something that obviously is a bigger issue than just the County Board and he feels our legislative representatives have to be brought in to discuss this issue along with the public defender's office. Schadewald would like to see the CJCJ spend the next six months to a year coming up with a solid plan and then he would vote for the money. The way this proposal was brought forward now reminds Schadewald of the \$1.1 million dollars for the mental health initiatives. Everyone was in favor of that, but it took three years to really get things going. Schadewald is going to vote no on this proposal with the understanding that he would like the CJCJ to work on a blueprint and a summation of what could be done with the judges' calendars, how they will go about finding additional public defenders, etc. The understanding of justice is not on the Brown County Board if the State has so many parts in the system such as the number of courts, the number of DAs and how much public defenders are paid.

Schadewald has also heard that there are alleged offenders sitting in jail who have trial dates but then ask to get a new lawyer which prolongs the process. Lasee said that Brown County has the highest percentage of any county of people asking for appointment of new public defenders. With respect to the blueprint, Lasee said he does not want the Committee to think that no planning was put into this. The suggestion for the three additional attorneys was so the DA's office could staff all eight branches the way the six branches are currently staffed. The three attorneys were directly tied to being able to spread the criminal calendar over eight branches instead of six and there have been discussions at the judicial level about the rotations moving into next year and there is a lot of support for all eight judges handling a criminal calendar. It is Lasee's understanding that the clear majority of the judges would prefer to have a one-eighth criminal calendar. The three additional staff was based on the ability to staff those eight branches which would spread the cases around evenly and move people through the system faster because each judge would have a lower percentage of the criminal calendar. Three additional positions were not picked out of thin air; they did have a plan.

Gruszynski referenced the District Attorney from Marinette who quit recently because of the case load and said this is something that is being seen across the entire State. He indicated there was a State study done saying Brown County needed 11.5 positions, but no relief was given in the current State budget. Gruszynski said it is obvious the State is not helping us out and he pushes back a little bit on what he has heard from the Committee that we are not throwing money at this to see what sticks because we have spent money on additional courts and on mental health. If the DA says three more positions could help alleviate the situation, he does not see it as being much different than what we have done already to try to alleviate the problem or at least slow it down. Gruszynski will support this at this time and he hopes that at the very least if the Board does not add these positions to the budget that they look at the study that was recommended by three supervisors to address the problem and do something. He feels this is critical and not supporting something in general is malpractice by the Board.

Buckley said the Public Safety Committee did look at the communication from the three supervisors to do something to address the problem and they asked the Internal Auditor to help get a process started. He also talked about a study that had been done already that should be brought forward. He does not feel it is a matter of not supporting the DA; it is a matter of if we do this and we do not get anywhere, we just spent a lot of money guessing if this was going to work. He does not think anyone will have a problem looking at this again later in the year after we have had time to come up with a firm plan and can show justification. Buckley feels we also need to see all eight judges on board and start to schedule these things on all their calendars. He also noted if this money is put forward in January, it will take time to get someone hired and up and running and then we will be in the judges' vacation schedules and these matters will not be going to trial until late summer or fall of next year. This will not do anything to help clear out the jail. Buckley noted this was originally started to alleviate the need to build a pod, but we are going to have to build it. If we are going to increase staff, it has to be done smartly and with a plan. He noted Brown County has already added two DAs at our own expense and the State has not added any staff, but they did give raises to the DA's office. We need to put pressure on our representatives at the State.

Sieber said from listening to the conversations tonight, it is obvious that we need an analysis of the entire system to find where the clogs are. He also heard of a study that indicated Brown County is also short two judges. He said we have been asking the State since he has been on the Board for more DAs but the State does not seem to take care of their responsibilities with the prisons, DA's office and a number of other things. It will be up to the County to handle the issues that are left unhandled by the State. Sieber said any study we do is going to indicate that additional DAs are needed. He does not know if they should be added now or later, but maybe adding them now would help alleviate some of the pressure in the system.

Sieber continued that the people sitting in the jail awaiting trial are presumed innocent. When a defendant releases a public defender or attorney and needs time to find a new one, it causes a delay that is not on the County; that is on the defendant. These people however are guaranteed a right to a speedy trial and it is completely and totally unacceptable

that we have people sitting in jail for six months because of our system. He feels beyond jail overcrowding our number one priority should be on making sure the people in jail get a fair and speedy trial.

Motion made by Supervisor Gruszynski, seconded by Supervisor Hoyer to approve. Vote taken. Aye: Gruszynski Nay: Lund, Moynihan, Buckley, Erickson, Hoyer, Schadewald. MOTION FAILED 1 to 6

Supervisor Buckley was excused at 6:45 pm.

At this time, the Committee returned to Item 7.

28. Discussion and possible action re: New position descriptions and organizational changes for Board staff.

Moynihan directed the Committee's attention to the information contained in the agenda packet. He noted there is no resolution for this because initially when this was brought forward in his budget discussions with the Executive, what he presented was frowned upon and that is why he is bringing it forth at this meeting. What he is proposing has been a work in progress and is long overdue and is a job classification correction. Moynihan continued that over the past few years there were a number of reasons given for not addressing this by Human Resources. What Board staff does is not something that someone else could just step into their roles to do. The job duties are outlined in the agenda items and Moynihan noted the jobs are very tedious and manual and involve a lot of coordinating with other departments for things like resolutions, communications, ordinances, mailings, etc. Having been put off the past few years on this, Moynihan went through the request for table of organization change process and gave new monikers to both positions. The administrative secretary position (Alicia) would be kept at the current pay grade, but the wage would be brought up to market. The Board secretary position (Therese) would be moved up one pay grade and brought up to market.

Moynihan continued that the staff does a lot of work, meetings are getting longer and more committees are being added to their workload. The office is very taxed and he feels this is a good remedy to properly show appreciation for the good work they do. He also noted there is a communication by Supervisor Becker regarding budgeting for video of meetings. Technology Services Director August Neverman recently sent out an e-mail regarding that which contained language that Board staff would have to be trained to take on additional responsibilities.

Moynihan said the proposed changes can be paid for by the money we saved from the internal audit RFP. He noted there is a host of reclassifications on tonight's agenda, some of which are very sizeable. Everyone in the County has an important role and he is not diminishing one position over another, but if anyone deserves a raise above and beyond, it is the Board staff. What Moynihan is bringing forward would not require a resolution and can be done on the Board floor. He urged the Committee to keep the personalities out of this and to consider the positions.

Weininger said the proper process for this pursuant to ordinance would be to make a motion at the time the department's budget is taken up and direct staff to prepare a resolution for the County Board so there is a fiscal impact. Technically, action cannot be taken on the County Board floor without a fiscal. Weininger continued that he and Corporation Counsel discussed the process over the last few weeks and the way the ordinance reads this would have to go to the oversight committee and then to Executive Committee with the appropriate fiscal. Moynihan said another option would be to do this as a committee of the whole. Weininger said if the budget is taken up as committee of the whole these actions can be taken, but if the budget is not brought up as committee of the whole, these types of actions cannot be taken. Alternatively, a committee of the whole could be done for this single item, but from a procedural standpoint, it would be easier to follow the rules by making an adjustment in the budget and then bringing a resolution to the County Board. Corporation Counsel Dave Hemery said the procedures for table of organization changes is set forth in the ordinances at 2.05(1) and states, "Any request for newly created positions or changes to existing positions in the table of organization will require review by the appropriate standing committee and approval of the County Board in the form of a resolution." He said he would be more than happy to draft a resolution.

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Gruszynski for Corporation Counsel to draft a resolution to reflect wages and benefits be increased by \$8,155 for the two Brown County Board Office administrative positions. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Supervisor Buckley said he is typically against reclassifications just to give people raises and he noted that there have been a lot of requests lately. In this case, however, he has talked to Chair Moynihan about the increased workload in the Board office as well as the fact that they have cut back on outside staffing that used to be brought in. Buckley said this is the first reclassification request in a long time that he agrees with and will support.

Moynihan reiterated he does not want to diminish any other positions in the County, but in looking in the budget book, there are numerous positions in numerous departments that do clerk – typist type work. He found two positions in Courts, six in the Clerk of Courts, three in the DA's office and five in the Sheriff's Office that all make a higher hourly wages than Therese for similar work. Again, he is not diminishing any position, but said the positions in the Board Office are two of a kind; nobody can just step in and do that work. He also noted there are times he is on the phone or e-mailing Board staff on Friday nights at 8:00 pm when they should be home with their families but instead are running around gathering items from other departments and then trying to find an open post office to get the packets out. This is another example of how Board staff goes above and beyond on a regular basis.

Erickson agreed with what is being said. Board staff really goes above and beyond and he sees that often they have stacks of work to do and are frazzled, but they never have a bad word to say and are always pleasant. He also noted that they do face the public and are always pleasant when people come in the side door looking for meter change, directions, or information. He said Board staff does a great job not only with their Board duties but they also do things like type up the veterans certificates for Veterans' Recognition Subcommittee and do other odd jobs that are asked of them, never with a harsh word. He agrees fully with this reclassification and supports the same.

Supervisor Sieber said he opposes this reclassification because he feels there needs to be consistency across the board. He said we have PayScale coming up which is a program where job descriptions are entered to find what similar positions are being paid both locally and across the country. Sieber also noted that 2% of wages are being set aside for wage adjustments according to the PayScale program. The County has never had a decent way to do this in the past so all of the appeals that the departments have had that are being pushed off will be decided through the PayScale program in coordination with the HR Director, department heads and HR consultants that come along with the PayScale program. Sieber feels all job descriptions should be re-written and then run through PayScale to find out where the wages are at for everyone across the board. He noted there are a number of resolutions on this agenda to increase pay for a lot of different positions and in the past we have done that because there was no other process in place. He would like to see a process in place to find out across the board where all of our employees stand. He noted we are talking about reclassing the journeyman electrician to a master electrician later in the meeting and then paying him the exact same amount as the master electricians. There are other examples of this with other positions and as these positions go through PayScale they will all be at the appropriate level. In this budget, Sieber would like to see all positions go through PayScale and then be reclassified accordingly and then handle any appeals instead of just giving blanket raises.

Sieber continued that he does not know where Moynihan got the figures he is proposing. Moynihan responded that the Grade 14 position is going to full market and the current Grade 17 is being moved to 16 at full market and he noted that he would have liked to move the 17 to a 15 but he knew that would fall on deaf ears. Sieber said there are a lot of employees throughout the County who are underpaid and 90 – 95% of them are going above and beyond and doing excellent work. He does not want to give the appearance that we are taking care of our own but not taking care of the rest of the County. Moynihan noted that he would likely approve every request being made tonight. Sieber feels the positions that would include wage increases should wait until PayScale. He is in favor of putting as much into the 2% pot as possible to catch up on compensation issues, catch up on raise issues, step issues and everything else. Sieber did agree that Board staff does excellent work but every other department head would also probably say the same thing. For these reasons, he is opposing this.

29. Resolution Approving New or Deleted Positions during the 2018 Budget Process in the Planning & Land Services Department.

A copy of this Resolution was distributed at the meeting, a copy of which is attached.

See motion to approve preceding Item 7.

****NON-BUDGET REVIEW****

Legal Bills

1. Review and Possible Action on Legal Bills to be paid.

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Schadewald to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Reports

2. Internal Auditor.

No Report; no action taken.

3. Human Resources Report.

Human Resources Director Kathryn Roellich informed that under Item 7 above, there should have been an ordinance revision attached that made a change to 4.57(1) (a copy of which is attached) and by not including it, a \$327,000+ deficit has been created so this will have to be addressed at some point. Moynihan said this can be addressed as committee of the whole under budget discussions at the budget meeting.

Also related to the budget, Weininger informed that at the Public Safety budget meeting several motions were made in connection with the proposed positions in the DA's office. One was to increase juror expenses in the Court budget, one was to increase overtime in the Sheriff's Department budget for increased security for trials and the other was to reduce the Sheriff's boarding and transportation budget. These motions should be unwound on the Board floor because no action can be taken on them at this time as those budgets are not before this Committee.

Motion made by Supervisor Schadewald, seconded by Supervisor Hoyer to receive and place on file. Vote taken.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

4. Department of Administration Report.

No Report, no action taken.

5. County Executive Report.

No Report, no action taken.

Other

6. Such other matters as authorized by law.

None.

7. Adjourn.

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Schadewald to adjourn at 7:12 pm. Vote taken.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Respectfully submitted,

Therese Giannunzio
Recording Secretary

November 1, 2017

Revised Human Resources – 10/23/17

TO THE HONORABLE CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS
OF THE BROWN COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Ladies and Gentlemen:

**RESOLUTION REGARDING UPDATES TO EXISTING EMPLOYEE
COMPENSATION DURING THE 2018 BUDGET PROCESS**

WHEREAS, the Brown County Executive submits a proposed budget to the Brown County Board of Supervisors for their consideration each year; and

WHEREAS, it is desired that the County Board approve of the below changes to Brown County employee compensation/wages contained in said 2018 proposed budget, and approve of the other below requests:

1. Request that general municipal employees (excluding collective bargaining employees, and excluding employees classified as emergency help, limited term, occasional part-time, and elected officials) will receive a 1.84% base wage salary increase as of January 1, 2018 as long as a rating of “satisfactory” or better is received on said employees’ 2017 annual performance evaluations, and new hires that are not newly created position, may receive the 1.84% within their offer letter after 6 months and a satisfactory performance review, and newly created positions that have not been budgeted for the 1.84% increase or the 2% set aside do not qualify for the increase; and
2. Request that 2% of levy supported base wages for eligible employees (excluding protective service collective bargaining employees, and excluding employees classified as emergency help, limited term, occasional part-time, and elected officials) will be set aside in the 2018 budget for wage adjustments to address classification and compensation plan updates and the Human Resources Department will develop and implement a new classification and compensation structure based on the following process: A) The Human

Resources Department will work with each department head to identify position descriptions that adequately represent the positions within said department; B) Once the department has agreed to the appropriate position description, the information will be used to determine market data; C) After establishing the market data, a new salary structure will be developed and implemented using the PayScale Software; and D) After implementation of the revised pay structure, the Human Resources Department will work in conjunction with each department head to address compensation issues including compression, internal equity, and pay equity to market data, utilizing a portion of the 2% wage set aside to address these issues; and

3. Request that the County will follow State and Federal guidelines for overtime compensation, and the Human Resources Department will work with departments to determine more equitable provisions for 'specialty pay' based on the needs of the department and staffing. This change is a result of the 2016 language change of Chapter 4 of the Brown County Ordinances, specifically, to subsection 4.57(1), which has had the following adverse effects: A) Created perceived disparity between employee groups; B) Significantly exceeded the projected fiscal impact; and C) Implementation and administration of this provision has proven difficult for both management and payroll. A portion of the funds from the 2% set aside shall be used to fund this initiative.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Brown County Board of Supervisors hereby approves of the above-mentioned requests, and hereby authorizes and directs that county administration take all necessary steps to carry out and effectuate the above-mentioned requests.

Fiscal Note: This resolution does not require an appropriation from the General Fund; these changes are included in the 2018 Budget.

Respectfully submitted,

Administration Committee,
Executive Committee

Approved By:

TROY STRECKENBACH
COUNTY EXECUTIVE

Date Signed: _____

Authorized by Human Resources
Approved by Corporation Counsel

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ROLL CALL # _____

Motion made by Supervisor _____

Seconded by Supervisor _____

SUPERVISORS	DIST.	AYES	NAYS	ABSTAIN	EXCUSED
SIEBER	1				
DE WANE	2				
NICHOLSON	3				
HOYER	4				
GRUSZYNSKI	5				
LEFEBVRE	6				
ERICKSON	7				
ZIMA	8				
EVANS	9				
VANDER LEEST	10				
BUCKLEY	11				
LANDWEHR	12				
DANTINNE, JR	13				

SUPERVISORS	DIST.	AYES	NAYS	ABSTAIN	EXCUSED
BRUSKY	14				
BALLARD	15				
KASTER	16				
VAN DYCK	17				
LINSSEN	18				
KNEISZEL	19				
CLANCY	20				
CAMPBELL	21				
MOYNIHAN, JR.	22				
BLOM	23				
SCHADEWALD	24				
LUND	25				
BECKER	26				

Total Votes Cast _____

Motion: Adopted _____ Defeated _____ Tabled _____

November 1, 2017

**AN ORDINANCE AMENDING SUBSECTION 4.57(1) OF SECTION 4.57 OF
CHAPTER 4 OF THE BROWN COUNTY CODE OF ORDINANCES ENTITLED
"OVERTIME AND COMPENSATORY TIME"**

THE BROWN COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS DOES ORDAIN AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1 – Subsection 4.57(1) of Section 4.57 of Chapter 4 of the Brown County Code of Ordinances entitled "Overtime and Compensatory Time" is hereby amended as follows:

4.57 POLICY. (1) Each position is designated as ~~either Non-exempt, or Exempt or Partially Exempt~~ from the Federal Fair Labor Standards Act and state wage and hour laws. Employees in non- exempt positions shall be compensated or receive compensatory time at a rate of one and one-half times normal pay for hours worked in excess of forty (40) hours in any work week. ~~Non-exempt full-time employees that do not work on vacation days or holidays will have up to eight (8) hours of each said vacation day or holiday counted as hours worked in the computation of weekly overtime, but this does not apply to part-time or Limited Term Employees, nor does this apply to exempt employees. Non-exempt full-time employees that do work on vacation days or holidays will be subject to normal payroll rules.~~ Per FLSA, some exceptions to the 40 hours per week standard apply under special circumstances to ~~sheriff and hospital and nursing home~~partially exempt employees. All time worked is subject to rounding rules.

Section 2 - This Ordinance Amendment shall become effective upon passage and publication pursuant to law.

Respectfully submitted,

ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Approved By:

COUNTY EXECUTIVE (Date)

COUNTY CLERK (Date)

COUNTY BOARD CHAIR (Date)

Authored by: Department of Administration

Final Draft Approved by Corporation Counsel

Fiscal Impact: *This ordinance does not require an appropriation from the General Fund.*

*Budget - 7
Non-Budget 3*

November 1, 2017

TO THE HONORABLE CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS
OF THE BROWN COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Ladies and Gentlemen:

RESOLUTION APPROVING CHANGES TO EMPLOYEE BENEFITS
DURING THE 2018 BUDGET PROCESS

WHEREAS, the Brown County Executive submits a proposed budget to the Brown County Board of Supervisors for their consideration each year; and,

WHEREAS, it is desirable to have the Brown County Board of Supervisors approve of and authorize changes to Brown County employee benefits as specified below.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Brown County Board of Supervisors hereby approves of and authorizes the following changes to employee benefits, effective January 1, 2018:

1. Employee premium contributions will be based on a 12% weighted average per the chart below for all covered employees and the County will pay the remaining 88% based on the weighted average; and

Personal Health Assessment (PHA) Tier Level and Points	Percent Paid of Total Cost by Employee	Coverage	Amount per Month
Non –Participant	25%	Single / Family	\$145.48/\$387.10
Tobacco User	20%	Single / Family	\$116.38/309.68
Standard (60 Points and below)	13%	Single / Family	\$75.66/\$201.28
Bronze 61 – 70 Points	12%	Single / Family	\$69.84/\$185.80
Silver 71 – 85 Points	11.5%	Single / Family	\$66.92/\$178.06
Gold 86 – 100 Points	11%	Single / Family	\$64.02/\$170.32

2. Employees wishing to improve their PHA Score have the option to participate in the health contingency wellness program, requiring employees to retest to validate the change in their

8

points and potential premium level. Improvements will be retroactive to the beginning of the year for the employee premium; and,

3. Wellness Contributions will continue to be funded at 0.00%; and County Wellness Activities will not be funded; and
4. The funds included in the 2018 Health and Dental Fund as “Wellness-Other” are designated for continuation of the FastCare Clinic contract or other similar contract; and
5. Monthly dental premiums will be as follows for employees; and

Provider/Plan	Single	Family
Delta Dental	\$3.06	\$8.60
Care Plus/Dental Associates	\$2.68	\$8.05

- ~~6. Employees who terminate employment or retire from Brown County who have an HRA balance will have 90 days to submit claims for services received prior to their termination date. After 90 days, unused balances will return to the county’s General Health and Dental Fund; and~~

7. Once an employee’s HRA account is at \$100 or less, the employee will have 90 days to submit claims for reimbursement. After 90 days, unused balances will return to the county’s General Health and Dental Fund; and

8. Contributions to the employees Wisconsin Retirement System will be in accordance with the rates established by the Department of Employee Trust Funds as follows; and

Employee Group	Employee Required	Employer Required	Duty Disability	Total
General	6.70	6.70	0.00	13.40
Elected	6.70	6.70	0.00	13.40
Protective	6.70	10.70	0.46	17.86

9. Retiree health insurance premiums will be increased to cover the projected loss for the retiree cost pool for the calendar year 2017 and shall be adjusted accordingly to capture actual costs; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that county administration is hereby authorized and directed to take any and all necessary steps to effectuate the changes to employee benefits as specified above in this Resolution.

Fiscal Note: This resolution does not require an appropriation from the General Fund; these changes are included in the 2018 Budget.

Respectfully submitted,
ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE,
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Approved By:

COUNTY EXECUTIVE (Date)

Authored by Human Resources

Approved by Corporation Counsel's Office

8

November 1, 2017

TO THE HONORABLE CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS
OF THE BROWN COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Ladies and Gentlemen:

RESOLUTION APPROVING NEW OR DELETED POSITIONS
DURING THE 2018 BUDGET PROCESS
IN THE PLANNING AND LAND SERVICES TABLE OF ORGANIZATION

WHEREAS, a New Position or Position Deletion Request was submitted by the Planning and Land Services Department ("Department") during the 2018 budget process; and

WHEREAS, on October 16, 2017 a motion was made at the Planning, Development, & Transportation Committee meeting to refer back to staff concerns regarding the continuing difficulty of filling the vacant Principle Planner position in the Department; and

WHEREAS, the demand for housing program assistance has increased due to additional community needs and increased awareness of the program, and the Department currently has a backlog of planning work due to commitments made prior to the vacancy of the Principal Planner position; and

WHEREAS, the Department is requesting the deletion of 1.00 FTE Principal Planner position and the addition of 2.00 FTE Senior Planner positions to the 2018 table of organization to assist with workload and operational needs in housing planning and general planning areas; and

WHEREAS, if the funding for these positions is eliminated in the future, then these positions will end and will be eliminated from the Planning and Land Services Department table of organization.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Brown County Board of Supervisors, that the Planning and Land Services Department table of organization is hereby changed by deleting 1.00 FTE Principal Planner position and by adding 2.00 FTE Senior Planner positions

through the 2018 budget process to be effective January 1, 2018, and as reflected in the 'Budget Impact' section below, subject to the condition that if the funding for these positions is eliminated in the future, then these positions will end and will be eliminated from the Planning and Land Services Department table of organization.

Budget Impact-

Position Title	FTE	Addition/ Deletion	Salary	Fringe	Total
Principal Planner @ \$35.04/hour (PG 7)	(1.00)	(Deletion)	(\$73,164)	(\$24,124)	(\$97,288)
Senior Planner @ \$30.31/hour (PG 9)	2.00	Addition	\$126,574	\$45,064	\$171,638
Planning and Land Services- Total 2018 Budget Impact					\$74,350

Fiscal Note: This resolution is not included in the 2018 Budget and does not require an appropriation from or increase to the General Fund. Expenses will be 100% funded through grants and local assistance contract revenues.

Respectfully submitted,
PLANNING, DEVELOPMENT, &
TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Approved By:

TROY STRECKENBACH
COUNTY EXECUTIVE

Date Signed: _____

Approved by Human Resources
Approved by Corporation Counsel

HUMAN RESOURCES DEPARTMENT

Brown County

305 E. WALNUT STREET
P.O. BOX 23600
GREEN BAY, WI 54305-3600



KATHRYN ROELICH

PHONE (920) 448-4071 FAX (920) 448-6277 WEB: www.co.brown.wi.us

HUMAN RESOURCES DIRECTOR

RESOLUTION/ORDINANCE SUBMISSION TO COUNTY BOARD

DATE: October 23, 2017
REQUEST TO: Executive Committee; and County Board
MEETING DATE: October 23, 2017; and November 1, 2017
REQUEST FROM: Kathryn Roellich
Human Resources Director
REQUEST TYPE: ☒ New resolution ☐ Revision to resolution
☐ New ordinance ☐ Revision to ordinance

TITLE: Resolution Approving New or Deleted Positions During the 2018 Budget Process in the Planning and Land Services Department table of organization

ISSUE/BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

A motion was made at the Planning, Development, & Transportation Committee meeting on October 16, 2017 to refer back to staff concerns regarding the Departments continuing difficulty in filling a vacant Principal Planner position.

ACTION REQUESTED:

Make the following changes to the Planning and Land Services Department table of organization

- Delete 1.00 FTE Principal Planner Position
- Add 2.00 FTE Senior Planner Positions

FISCAL IMPACT:

NOTE: This fiscal impact portion is initially completed by requestor, but verified by the DOA and updated if necessary.

1. Is there a fiscal impact? ☒ Yes ☐ No
 - a. If yes, what is the amount of the impact? \$74,350
 - b. If part of a bigger project, what is the total amount of the project? _____
 - c. Is it currently budgeted? ☐ Yes ☒ No It is not reflected in the 2018 budget.
 1. If yes, in which account? _____
 2. If no, how will the impact be funded? 1.00 FTE Senior Planner will be covered 100% by CDBG Grant, and the other 1.00 FTE Senior Planner will be covered by other grant and local assistance contract revenues; therefore these changes do not reflect a levy impact.

☒ **COPY OF RESOLUTION OR ORDINANCE IS ATTACHED**